

# Board of Adjustment



## *Minutes*

### City Council Chambers, Lower Level January 10, 2012

#### **Board Members Present:**

Garrett McCray, Chair  
Tyler Stradling  
Greg Hitchens  
Danette Harris  
Cameron Jones

#### **Staff Present:**

Gordon Sheffield  
Mia Lozano-Helland  
Lesley Davis  
Angelica Guevara  
Wahid Alam

#### **Board Members Absent:**

Nicholas Labadie, excused  
Diane von Borstel, excused

#### **Others Present:**

Teri Davis            Jon Beach  
Janet A. Kelly      Lucas Shaw  
Rodrick G. Kelly  
Larry Johnson  
Ken Willmon  
Gary Dahlke  
Willy Heinrich  
Carole & William Henningsen

The study session began at 4:38 p.m. The Public Hearing meeting began at 5:57 p.m. Before adjournment at 7:00 p.m., the following items were considered and recorded.

#### **Study Session began at 4:38 p.m.**

##### A. Zoning Administrator's Report:

1. By-Laws and Rules of Procedure – Mr. Sheffield asked the Board if there were any potential revisions. The Board asked to review the question again at a later date.
2. Presentation on Form-Based Code – Mr. Sheffield made a presentation on Form-Based Codes and provided comments. A brief discussion followed with questions from the Board.

##### B. The items scheduled for the Board's Public Hearing were discussed.

#### **Public Hearing 5:57 p.m.**

- A. Consider Minutes from the December 13, 2011 Meeting a motion was made to approve the minutes by Board member Stradling and seconded by Board member Jones. Vote: Passed 5-0
- B. Consent Agenda #1 a motion to approve the consent agenda as read was made by Board member Stradling and seconded by Board member Jones. Vote: Passed 5-0-2 (von Borstel and Labadie - absent)

Consent Agenda #2 a motion to approve the consent agenda as read was made by Board member Jones and seconded by Board member Stradling. Vote: Passed 4-0-3 (von Borstel and Labadie – absent, Hitchens abstained)

- C. Consent Agenda #3 a motion to approve the consent agenda as read was made by Board member Hitchens and seconded by Board member Stradling. Vote: Passed 4-0-3 (von Borstel and Labadie – absent, Jones abstained)

**Board of Adjustment Meeting  
January 10, 2012**

**Case No.:** BA12-001

**Location:** 1253 South Gilbert Road

**Subject:** Requesting a Special Use Permit (SUP) to modify an existing comprehensive sign plan in the LC zoning district. (PLN2011-00356)

**Decision:** Approved with conditions

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and not discussed on an individual basis.

**Motion:** It was moved by Board member Stradling, seconded by Board member Jones to approve case BA12-001 with the following conditions:

1. *Compliance with the sign plan submitted, except as modified by the conditions listed below.*
2. *Any additional signage not identified with this Sign Plan will require modification to this Special Use Permit.*
3. *Compliance with all requirements of the Development and Sustainability Department with regard to the issuance of building permits.*

**Vote:** Passed 5-0-2 (von Borstel and Labadie - absent)

**Findings:**

- 1.1 The applicant was approved for a Special Use Permit (SUP) to establish a comprehensive sign plan (CSP) on a vacant office building site being redeveloped into for use by a daycare. The development consists of a two-story building with frontage on both Gilbert Rd. and Hampton Ave. The site is surrounded by an existing group commercial development located north and east of the subject property, which is not directly linked to this site via drive aisles, driveways, or any shared parking.
- 1.2 The site is zoned OC, current Code allows only two signs on the parcel not exceeding a combined area of one (1) square foot per each 5 lineal feet of street frontage based on each street frontage with a maximum area of 32 square feet per sign, and if detached no to exceed 8 feet in height. As a result, the site would be permitted four signs (combined attached and detached). To ensure adequate signage for the tenant, the comprehensive sign plan allows attached signs as would be allowed on commercial sites. Detached signs are consistent with current Code maximums.
- 1.3 Commercial sites having buildings occupying more than 100 feet are allowed a maximum of three attached signs not to exceed two square feet of total sign area for each front foot of building occupancy with a maximum of total attached signage at 160 square feet.
- 1.4 The existing office development would be permitted one detached sign adjacent to Gilbert Road. The applicant is proposing an 8 foot tall, 32 s.f. detached sign.
- 1.5 The proposed plan indicates two attached signs on the north and south elevations will be non-illuminated individual pan channel letters and logo at 59 s.f. each. The signs will be compatible

**Board of Adjustment Meeting  
January 10, 2012**

with the commercial development surrounding the site and will provide a subtle and appropriate transition to the neighboring multi-family development to the south of the site.

- 1.6** The proposed signage at the site complies with current Code requirements related to area and height and are consistent with signs found in commercial developments surrounding the site.
- 1.7** The Office Commercial Zoning on the property allows small-scale medical and professional offices, as well as day care centers. The proposed use on the site is a day care which the property owner is requesting to advertise more like a commercial use and is requesting commercial type signage on the property.
- 1.8** The proposed CSP is largely consistent with current Code requirements, and the minor deviations requested related to the number of attached signs result in a plan that is complimentary to adjacent development and consistent with the use of the property. Therefore, the CSP, with the recommended conditions, will be compatible with, and not detrimental to, adjacent properties or the neighborhood in general.

**Board of Adjustment Meeting  
January 10, 2012**

**Case No.:** BA12-002

**Location:** 2115 West Guadalupe Road

**Subject:** Requesting a Special Use Permit to allow a commercial communication tower to exceed the maximum height allowed in the LC zoning district. (PLN2011-00317)

**Decision:** Approved with conditions

**Summary:** Michael Campbell presented the case and that the previous telecommunication tower was not conducive to a co-location thus requiring this project.

Lucas Shaw, 2834 South Paseo Loma spoke in opposition to the installation of a new monopalm and stated that he would prefer to see a co-location instead. He further commented that he did not feel that there had been enough information presented to the adjacent property owners. Chair McCray asked Mr. Shaw what additional information he required. Mr. Shaw responded that he would like to have more information on telecommunication towers in general.

Gordon Sheffield provided the details of telecommunication tower and the average heights. Mr. Shaw asked if the height could be lowered.

Mr. Campbell explained the difficulties in co-locating on a monopalm. He also spoke of the improved design of monopalms and the limited visibility to the adjacent residents.

Mr. Alam confirmed that the applicant had followed the appropriate notification procedures.

**Motion:** It was moved by Board member Jones seconded by Board member Harris to approve case BA12-002 with the following conditions:

1. *Compliance with the site plan submitted except as modified by the conditions below.*
2. *The commercial communication tower shall utilize a Faux Date Palm design with a minimum of 65 palm fronds. Ten palm fronds shall be a minimum of 10-feet in length.*
3. *Provide cladding on the trunk of the monopalm to resemble the bark of a natural palm tree.*
4. *Provide a palm frond bulb growth otherwise known as a pineapple below the palm fronds*
5. *All antennas, mounting hardware, and other equipment near the antennas shall be painted to match the color of the palm fronds*
6. *The commercial communication tower shall have a maximum height of sixty-five feet (65').*
7. *The antennas shall not exceed 72" long x 11.2" wide x 5.2" deep.*
8. *The 23' x 37'-7" lease area containing the equipment shelter shall be screened by an 8' high masonry wall and solid metal gates.*
9. *The operator of the monopalm shall respond to and complete all identified maintenance and repair of the facility within 30-days of receiving written notice of the problem.*
10. *Provide a permanent, weather-proof identification sign, approximately 16 inches by 32 inches in size on the gate of the fence identifying the facility operator(s), operator's address, and 24-hour telephone number for reaching the operator or an agent authorized*

## Board of Adjustment Meeting January 10, 2012

*to provide 24/7 response to emergency situations.*

11. *No later than 90 days from the date the use is discontinued or the cessation of operations, the owner of the abandoned tower or the owner of the property on which the facilities are sited shall remove all equipment and improvements associated with the use and shall restore the site to its original condition as shown on the plans submitted with the original approved application. The owner or his agent shall provide written verification of the removal of the wireless communications facility within 30 days of the date the removal is completed,*
12. *Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Division with regard to the Issuance of building permits.*
13. *Maintenance of the facility shall conform to the requirements of section 11-35-5-l.*

**Vote:** Passed 5-0-2 (von Borstel and Labadie - absent)

### **Findings:**

- 1.1 The Special Use Permit (SUP) allows for the placement of a 65-foot high monopalm at the corner of the existing shopping center adjacent to parking lot with the equipment area behind the shopping center. The applicant notified all property owners within 500-feet of the request and to date, no comments or concerns were received from neighbors.
- 1.2 Based on the plans submitted, identified as site PHO EL MANGO, the proposed Commercial Communication Tower, the associated equipment shelter will be located within a 23' x 37'-7" lease area located at the rear of the shopping center. The applicant will surround the equipment area with an 8' tall masonry wall with solid metal gates to adequately screen the shelter, and all associated equipment.
- 1.3 The Board added a condition of approval requiring 65 palm fronds to help screen the antennas. Of the 65 palm fronds, ten fronds shall be a minimum of ten-feet in length. In addition, the antennas and all mounting hardware will be painted to match the green color of the palm fronds. Below the palm fronds, a growth bulb otherwise known as the pineapple will be provided as shown on the elevations of the monopalm. Further, cladding resembling the bark of a natural date palm shall be provided along the entire length of the pole, making the monopalm trunk appear more realistic
- 1.4 The tower is 332' from the right-of-way to the north, 138'-9" from the west property line, 262'-3" from the south property line, and 654' from the right-of-way to the east. There were no concerns with the location of the communication tower or its proximity to the property lines.
- 1.5 The conditions of approval ensured the materials used to conceal the antennas will minimize its visibility. As a result, the monopalm is compatible with, and not detrimental to, adjacent properties or the neighborhood in general.

\*\*\*\*

**Board of Adjustment Meeting  
January 10, 2012**

**Case No.:** BA12-003

**Location:** 301 South Power Road

**Subject:** Requesting a Special Use Permit (SUP) for a comprehensive sign plan in the LC and OC zoning districts. (PLN2011-00365)

**Decision:** Approved with conditions

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and not discussed on an individual basis.

**Motion:** It was moved by Board member Stradling, seconded by Board member Jones to approve case BA12-003 with the following conditions:

1. *Compliance with the sign plan submitted, except as modified by the conditions below.*
2. *Each tenant shall be allowed attached sign quantity and sign areas consistent with the requirements of the Limited Commercial (LC) Zoning District, regardless of the underlying zoning district.*
3. *No attached signs shall be permitted on the rear (east) elevation of future Building B.*
4. *Detached signage shall be limited to one (1) sign, with a maximum sign area of twenty-four square feet (24 s.f.) and six-feet (6') in height.*
5. *Compliance with all requirements of the Development and Sustainability Department in the issuance of sign permits.*

**Vote:** Passed 5-0-2 (von Borstel and Labadie – absent)

**Findings:**

- 1.1 The subject site received site plan approval for two, multi-tenant medical office buildings, of which one building has been constructed (Building A on the site plan) in 2011. Due to the existing zoning designations, the western portion of Building A is zoned LC and the western portion of Building A and Building B are zoned OC. Within the LC zoning district, tenants are allowed two or three signs and a maximum aggregate sign area of 160 sf (depending on building frontage). Within the OC zoning district, the *entire development* is allowed two signs total (attached and detached) and no sign can exceed 32 square feet in area.
- 1.2 The applicant was approved for a CSP to allow tenants within the eastern portion of Building A and future tenants of Building B the same attached sign allowances as tenants in the western portion of Building A. The CSP will allow attached signs for all tenants of Building A and Building B consistent with LC zoning, regardless of the underlying zoning. The CSP also includes a future 24 sf, six-foot high monument sign adjacent to Baywood Avenue, in the northeast corner of the site.
- 1.3 This medical office development has limited frontage on Power Road and visibility from the street is somewhat limited by intervening buildings. The development is accessed from a shared drive with an Albertson's anchored group commercial development and includes cross-access with that development. The CSP approved only one six-foot high detached monument sign with a sign area of 24 sf. As a result the additional attached sign allowances for the OC zoned portion of the development and the CSP, including the recommended conditions of approval, will be compatible with, and not detrimental to, adjacent properties or the neighborhood in general.

## **Board of Adjustment Meeting January 10, 2012**

**Case No.:** BA12-004

**Location:** 7750 East Broadway Road

**Subject:** Requesting a Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow manufactured homes (MH) within a recreational vehicle (RV) park in the RM-2-PAD zoning district. (PLN2011-00369)

**Decision:** Approved with conditions

**Summary:** Willie Heinrich, President of the Carriage Manor Board, summarized the request for the 911-lot park and stated that 20% of the park residents live there year round. Mr. Heinrich stated that there was an election scheduled that would include a question to the homeowner's association members regarding this Special Use Permit. He further discussed the greater value of removing the outdated park models with AZ rooms in the park and replacing them with manufactured homes.

Mary Candelaria, general manager of Carriage Manor explained that this request was in response to a desire of the residents to have mobile homes allowed in the park. She reviewed the citizen notification that had been accomplished as well as the dates of information meetings that were held. Chair McCray asked her how many meetings were held and how residents could communicate their comments. Ms. Candelaria responded that there two Board of Director's work sessions, and there were also meetings on 12/28/2011 and 11/23/2011.

Board member Harris asked what percentage of the Carriage Manor homeowner's association needed to agree with the request to pass approval. Ms. Candelaria responded that a vote of 60% approval would be required.

Chair McCray called for comments from interested citizens:

Larry Johnson, 7750 E. Broadway Rd. # 436, spoke in favor of the request.

Gary Dalke, 7750 E. Broadway Rd. #200, spoke in favor of the request and commented that the total roof area and setbacks would not change and that this would be a better utilization of the property.

Ken Willmon, 7750 E. Broadway Rd. #581, spoke in favor and would like to replace his current unit with a manufactured home if the case is approved.

Michelle Saboda, 1360 W. Isabella Ave, spoke in favor of the request.

William Henningsen, 7750 E. Broadway Rd. #484, spoke in opposition stating that Carriage Manor is an RV Park and felt that the change would affect the tax structure. He did not feel that the residents had been informed that the new unit would be manufactured homes.

John Beach, 7750 E. Broadway Rd. #530, stated he is a resident in the park for six months of the year and does not want manufactured homes in the RV Park. He felt that allowing manufactured homes would devalue the existing properties.

## **Board of Adjustment Meeting January 10, 2012**

Janet Kelly, 7750 E. Broadway Rd. #531, stated that she resides in the park six months of the year and would prefer that the manufactured homes be limited to one area of the park. She further stated that a mix of units would look 'hodge podge' and unattractive. She was also concerned with the possible change in tax structure.

Roderick Kelly, 7750 E. Broadway Rd. #531, stated that he is opposed and was concerned that many of the residents do not realize that the units in question are manufactured homes. He further stated that he felt that the residents were not given enough information and also cited taxes. He asked that action on this request be delayed until the residents fully understood the implications.

Mr. Heinrich rebutted explaining that the notification process was done fairly and that the information was distributed to the residents in several forms. He further stated that informational meetings were held over several months where the similarities of the two types of unit, except for size, were discussed. He stated that one of the meetings was attended by 130 residents.

Board member Hitchens asked Mr. Heinrich what types of homes currently existed in Carriage Manor. Mr. Heinrich responded that they were park models. He also explained that if manufactured homes were to be approved they would be brought in and set the same as park models. He further clarified that the park residents would be voting on whether to allow manufactured homes on February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

Chair MrCray asked Mr. Heinrich if Carriage Manor was exclusively an RV park. Mr. Heinrich stated that it began that way and provided a brief history of the 26 year old park and the evolution of the structures that have been there over the years.

Angelica Guevara provided the staff report and recommendations. She also commented on the various notifications that were performed by the applicant.

Board member Hitchens asked if the City would be advised of the vote outcome once Carriage Manor has their election in February. Mr. Sheffield stated that staff would call Carriage Manor to determine if the residents had approved the use of manufactured homes. Mr. Sheffield also briefly commented on the methods used for the taxation of park models versus manufactured homes.

Board member Jones stated that he was in favor of the request and that the appropriateness of allowing manufactured homes is up to the residents to vote on. He was satisfied that the applicant has satisfied the requirements of the code.

Board member Hitchens agreed and was in support of the request. He also encouraged the resident to work together for a solution that is agreeable to all.

Board member Harris stated she was in support of the request.

Chair McCray agreed with the statements from the Board and asked for a motion.



## Board of Adjustment Meeting January 10, 2012

**Motion:** It was moved by Board member Stradling, seconded by Board member Jones to approve case BA12-004 with the following conditions:

1. *Compliance with the site plan submitted, unless modified by the conditions below.*
2. *The City of Mesa has agreed to install landscape improvements along Broadway and Sossaman Roads as part of Project No. 01-716-001 which includes roadway improvements for Broadway Road from Power to Hawes. The project is bond funded, if for any reason, the landscape improvements are not installed with this project, the landscape improvements shall be installed by Carriage Manor RV Park within 6-months of notification by the City of Mesa. If this occurs, landscape material quantities shall be provided as designed with the roadway improvement project or as indicated in Chapter 33 of the Zoning Ordinance Table 11-33-3-A-4.*
3. *Landscape adjacent to 79th Pl. will need to be provided by the Carriage Manor RV Park upon the City's completion of the roadway improvements on Broadway Road and shall be of similar quantity and plant palette to be compatible with the landscaping to be provided with Project No. 01-716-001 with final landscape plan approval by Planning Division staff.*
4. *The placement of two identical elevations on adjacent lots or on lots across the street from each other shall be prohibited.*
5. *Compliance with all requirements of the Development and Sustainability Division with regard to the issuance of building permits.*

**Vote:** Passed 5-0-2 (von Borstel and Labadie - absent)

### Findings:

- 1.1 The approved Special Use Permit allows the placement of MHs on RV spaces within the 69.8 acre Carriage Manor RV Resort development. In total, 911 RV spaces are eligible for the placement of MHs.
- 1.2 The SUP exceeds the minimum requirements for overall park size criteria (69.8 acres where 10 acres is minimum); exceeds the minimum space size criteria (minimum 1,800 square feet where 1,200 square feet is minimum); exceeds the minimum space width and depth criteria (minimum 36'x50' where 34'x40' is minimum); exceeds the minimum parking criteria; exceeds the minimum open space and recreational area criteria (392,040 square feet where 136,650 square feet is minimum); and complies with the maximum enclosed floor area for units (690 square feet where 1,100 square feet is maximum). The applicant also has the option of introducing larger units provided they comply with the maximum floor area and setback requirements
- 1.3 The approval is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements. The subject site is designated Medium Density Residential, 4-6 dwelling units/acre in the General Plan. Consistent with the Zoning, the overall development results in a density of 12.13 dwelling units/acre where 15 dwelling units/acre is allowed. The approval is also consistent with General Plan policies that support variety in housing stock, revitalization of existing developments, and improved housing construction standards and housing efficiency

**Board of Adjustment Meeting  
January 10, 2012**

- 1.4** The conditions of approval included the provision of landscape by a roadway improvement project along Broadway and Sossaman Roads and the provision of landscape along 79<sup>th</sup> Pl. by the RV Park upon the completion of the roadway improvement project. The provision of new landscaping will represent significant improvement in compliance with current perimeter landscaping requirements.

**Board of Adjustment Meeting  
January 10, 2012**

- 1.5** To be consistent with the City's residential design guidelines and encourage variety in the development of the subdivision, a condition of approval was included that prohibits: 1) the placement of two identical elevations on adjacent lots or on lots across the street from each other; 2) the placement of more than two identical elevations with different exterior colors within five consecutive lots on the same side of the street
- 1.6** The applicant performed neighborhood outreach, including a neighborhood meeting, notification of public hearing to all property owners within 300 feet of the RV Park, and provision of hearing and meeting information to park residents. No opposition was received.

\* \* \* \*

## Board of Adjustment Meeting January 10, 2012

**Case No.:** BA12-005

**Location:** 540 South Drew Street

**Subject:** Requesting a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP) to allow the conversion of an existing warehouse to an office in the G1 zoning district. (PLN2011-00374)

**Decision:** Approved with conditions

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and not discussed on an individual basis.

**Motion:** It was moved by Board member Jones, seconded by Board member Stradling to approve case BA12-005 with the following conditions:

1. *Compliance with the site plan submitted except as modified by the conditions below.*
2. *Removal of all chain link fencing visible from Drew Street.*
3. *A dust control adhesive shall be applied to the unpaved drive aisle from 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the rear parking field.*
4. *Provision of a minimum twenty-foot (20') deep concrete or asphalt transition, measured from the back of the sidewalk, between the dust proof gravel drive aisle to the rear parking field and the 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue right-of-way.*
5. *Compliance with all requirements of the Building Safety Division with regard to the issuance of building permits.*

**Vote:** Passed 4-0-3 (Hitchens - abstained, Labadie and von Borstel – absent)

### Findings:

- 1.1 The applicant was approved for a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP) to allow the intensification of an existing nonconforming site. The project consists of the conversion of approximately 5,500 square-feet of warehouse space into office use. The existing site condition includes a 10,533 square foot building, consisting of 2,828 square feet of office and 7,705 square feet of warehouse. The overall building remains the same, but the area devoted to office use will increase to 8,360 square feet and the area devoted to warehouse use will decrease to 2,173 square feet.
- 1.2 Consistent with the requirements for review of a SCIP, full compliance with current Code development standards would require significant alteration to the existing development site, including demolition of existing buildings, elimination of on-site parking, and the disruption of vehicular circulation. Minor modifications to the site have been approved that improve the overall compliance with current development standards. These improvements include the provision of two parking lot landscape islands with one, 24-inch box tree and four 1-gallon shrubs each in the parking field adjacent to Drew Street, the provision of parking consistent with Code requirements, the provision of ADA accessible parking, the replacement of chain link fencing with wrought iron, and the construction of a 6-foot CMU wall to screen residential uses to the west.
- 1.3 The approved deviations include: 1) maintenance of zero-setbacks from the all property lines, 2) maintenance of reduced foundation base width at the front of the building, 3) minor reduction in

**Board of Adjustment Meeting  
January 10, 2012**

the size of four parking spaces (8.5' wide vs. 9' wide), 4) a six-foot high fence in the front setback, 5) maintenance of unscreened roof-mounted equipment, and 6) with the exception of the proposed parking lot landscape islands, no on-site landscaping. Given the limited space to accommodate setbacks, the very industrial nature of the area, the prevailing pattern of zero-setback development, and neighborhood security concerns, such deviations were justified.

- 1.4** An additional deviation related to maintenance of chain link fencing along the north property line. Currently, chain link fencing exists on the entire length of the north property line not occupied by building. The first 20 feet west of Drew Street will be replaced with wrought iron fencing and the remainder will stay chain link. As specifically stated in the Zoning Ordinance, chain link may only be used when not visible from public view. As can be noted from the site photographs, this area is visible from public view. To address this concern, a condition of approval requiring the replacement of the chain link fencing in this area was recommended.
- 1.5** The deviations allow the continued use of nonconforming site project will result in improved compliance with parking, landscape, screening, and fence material standards. The site plan, including the conditions of approval, provides substantial conformance with current standards and will be compatible with and not detrimental to the surrounding neighborhood.

\* \* \* \*

## Board of Adjustment Meeting January 10, 2012

**Case No.:** BA12-006

**Location:** 1365 South Gilbert Road

**Subject:** Requesting a Special Use Permit for a Comprehensive Sign Plan in the OC zoning district. (PLN2011-382)

**Decision:** Approved with conditions

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and not discussed on an individual basis.

**Motion:** It was moved by Board member Hitchens, seconded by Board member Stradling to approve case BA12-006 with the following conditions:

- 1. Compliance with the sign plan submitted, except as modified by the conditions listed below.*
- 2. Any additional signage not identified with this Sign Plan will require modification to this Special Use Permit.*
- 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development and Sustainability Department with regard to the issuance of building permits.*

**Vote:** Passed 5-0-3 (Jones - abstained, von Borstel and Labadie - absent)

**Findings:**

- 1.1** The applicant was approved for a Special Use Permit (SUP) to establish a comprehensive sign plan (CSP) on a vacant office building site being redeveloped into for use by a daycare. The development consists of a two-story building with frontage on both Gilbert Rd. and Hampton Ave. The site is surrounded by an existing group commercial development located north and east of the subject property, which is not directly linked to this site via drive aisles, driveways, or any shared parking.
- 1.2** The site is zoned OC, current Code allows only two signs on the parcel not exceeding a combined area of one (1) square foot per each 5 lineal feet of street frontage based on each street frontage with a maximum area of 32 square feet per sign, and if detached no to exceed 8 feet in height. As a result, the site would be permitted four signs (combined attached and detached). To ensure adequate signage for the tenant, the comprehensive sign plan allows attached signs as would be allowed on commercial sites. Detached signs are consistent with current Code maximums.
- 1.3** Commercial sites having buildings occupying more than 100 feet are allowed a maximum of three attached signs not to exceed two square feet of total sign area for each front foot of building occupancy with a maximum of total attached signage at 160 square feet.
- 1.4** The existing office development would be permitted one detached sign adjacent to Gilbert Road. The applicant was approved for an 8 foot tall, 32 s.f. detached sign.
- 1.5** The plan indicated that two attached signs on the north and south elevations will be non-illuminated individual pan channel letters and logo at 59 s.f. each. The signs are compatible with

**Board of Adjustment Meeting  
January 10, 2012**

the commercial development surrounding the site and provide a subtle and appropriate transition to the neighboring multi-family development to the south of the site.

- 1.6** The signage at the site complies with current Code requirements related to area and height and are consistent with signs found in commercial developments surrounding the site.
- 1.7** The Office Commercial Zoning on the property allows small-scale medical and professional offices, as well as day care centers. The existing use on the site is a day care which the property owner wanted to advertise more like a commercial use and was approved for commercial type signage on the property.
- 1.8** The CSP is largely consistent with current Code requirements, and the minor deviations related to the number of attached signs result in a plan that is complimentary to adjacent development and consistent with the use of the property. Therefore, the CSP, with the conditions, will be compatible with, and not detrimental to, adjacent properties or the neighborhood in general.

**C. Other Business:**

None

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon Sheffield, AICP  
Zoning Administrator

Minutes written by Mia Lozano, Planning Assistant

G: Board of Adjustment/Minutes/2012/January2012